

Zürich University Preprint
ZU-TH 32/93

Einstein-Yang-Mills sphalerons and fermion number non-conservation

Mikhail S. Volkov¹

Institut für Theoretische Physik der Universität Zürich-Irchel,
Winterthurerstrasse 190, CH-8057 Zürich,
Switzerland

Abstract

It is argued that the sphaleron solutions appearing in the Einstein-Yang-Mills theory are important in the transition processes at extremely high energies. Namely, when the energy exceeds the sphaleron mass, the existence of these solutions ensures constructive interference on the set of the overbarrier transition histories interpolating between distinct topological sectors of the theory. This has to lead to an enhancement of the transition rate and the related non-conservation of the fermion number.

¹On leave from Physical-Technical Institute of the Academy of Sciences of Russia, Kazan 420029, Russia

The discovery of the vacuum periodicity in Yang-Mills (YM) theory [1] gave rise to the theoretical description of baryon number non-conservation [2] caused by the anomalous violation of chirality [3]. The standard approach to understanding this phenomenon uses transitions between topologically distinct YM vacua divided by a potential barrier. In an unbroken YM theory (like QCD) this barrier has no definite height and can be made infinitely small due to the scale invariance. In a spontaneously broken theory (like the electroweak one) the scale invariance is explicitly violated by the Higgs field vacuum expectation value, and the potential barrier acquires definite non-zero minimal height. The certain value of this height is defined by the mass of the electroweak sphaleron solution “sitting” on the top of the barrier [4]. When the energy is small, all histories interpolating between distinct topological sectors encounter the barrier, which leads to the tunneling suppression. On the other hand, when the energy (or temperature) exceeds the barrier height, the system may pass freely over the barrier, causing an efficient non-conservation of the fermion number [5, 6].

When the energy is very high, it is natural to expect the symmetry to be restored. However, another universal scale arises naturally at the extremely high energies, namely, the gravitational Planck length. It is interesting to consider the possibility of the scale invariance being violated by this length. As is known, in the Einstein-Yang-Mills (EYM) theory there exist regular particle-like solutions [7]. Similarly to the electroweak sphaleron, these solutions are “sitting” on the top of the potential barrier dividing distinct vacua, which allows them also to be interpreted as sphalerons [8]. One may think that the masses of these EYM sphalerons, as in the electroweak theory, define the typical value of energies when the fermion number non-conservation becomes significant.

There is, however, an important difference between the EYM sphalerons and their electroweak counterpart. It turns out that the masses of the EYM sphalerons do not define the *minimal* value of the barrier height, as the latter may be arbitrarily small [8]. This situation resembles that appearing in the scale invariant YM theory because gravity, while violating the scale invariance and making the existence of the sphalerons possible, may only reduce the potential energy. In other words, the profile of the potential barrier is different in this case; there are gaps in the barrier, and the sphalerons correspond to critical saddle points on the barrier surface with more than one negative direction of instability. This means that the overbarrier passages

in the EYM theory are always possible, not only when the energy exceeds the sphaleron mass. At first glance, this makes the physical meaning of the EYM sphalerons and their role in the enhancement of the transition rate at high energies unclear.

The purpose of this paper is to show that the EYM sphalerons are nevertheless important in the transition processes due to the interference effects. Namely, we argue that when the energy exceeds the sphaleron mass, the existence of the critical points on the barrier surface ensures constructive interference on the set of the overbarrier transition histories. This has to lead to an enhancement of the transition intensity. When the energy is small, the overbarrier histories also exist, however, the constructive interference is absent. We conclude therefore that the rate of the fermion number violating processes increases when the energy exceeds the sphaleron mass.

Our aim is to estimate (in the lowest order WKB approximation) the amplitude of the fermion number violating transition in the EYM theory at non-zero energy. The theoretical tool relevant for our purposes has been developed by Bitar and Chang in their real time analysis of tunneling transitions in the flat space YM theory [9]. The idea of this method is, first, to define a one-parameter continuous family of static field configurations in the configuration function space of a theory, such that this family connects two vacuum sectors with different winding numbers. Let us call such a family a vacuum-to-vacuum (VTV) path. Then one assumes that the transition between distinct vacuum sectors of the theory proceeds along this single VTV path. This reduces the problem to a one-dimensional quantum-mechanical task, and allows one to find the corresponding WKB amplitude. The last step is to take the sum over all VTV paths. Of course, in order to be able to follow this program, we apply some approximations.

Consider the action of the EYM theory with the $SU(2)$ gauge group

$$S_{EYM} = S_G + S_{YM}, \quad (1)$$

with the gravitational part

$$S_G = -\frac{1}{16\pi G} \int R \sqrt{-g} d^4x - \frac{1}{16\pi G} \oint_{\Sigma} (g^{\mu\alpha} \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^{\beta} - g^{\alpha\beta} \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^{\mu}) d\Sigma_{\mu}, \quad (2)$$

and the Yang-Mills contribution

$$S_{YM} = -\frac{1}{2g^2} \int tr F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} \sqrt{-g} d^4x. \quad (3)$$

Here G is Newton's constant, g is the gauge coupling constant, $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu - i[A_\mu, A_\nu]$ is the matrix valued gauge field tensor, $A_\mu = A_\mu^a \tau^a/2$, and τ^a ($a = 1, 2, 3$) are the Pauli matrices. We use the gravitational action, which does not contain second derivatives of the metric and reduces to the well-known two-gamma action [22] when an event horizon is absent; the surface term in Eq.(2) is non-covariant, and quasi-Cartesian coordinates are used for calculation of it (we are working in an asymptotically flat spacetime) [23]. Our sign conventions used are those of Landau & Lifshitz [22].

The action (1) has many stationary points, including solutions with non-trivial space-time topology such as black holes [10]. Consider a sector with spacetime manifolds carrying the trivial R^4 topology. Define vacua in this sector as the stationary points of the action with zero ADM energy. As follows from the positive energy theorem [11], such vacua must have a flat metric and hence the YM field is a pure gauge. In the $A_0 = 0$ gauge, one can represent the vacuum fields as

$$A_j(\vec{x}) = iU\partial_j U^{-1}, \quad g_{\mu\nu}(\vec{x}) = \eta_{\mu\nu}, \quad (4)$$

where $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ is the flat spacetime metric, $U(\vec{x})$ is a $SU(2)$ valued function, and spatial index j runs over 1,2,3 ($\vec{x} \equiv x^j$). As is known, if the function $U(\vec{x})$ in Eq.(4) satisfies the following additional condition [1]:

$$\lim_{|\vec{x}| \rightarrow \infty} U(\vec{x}) = 1, \quad (5)$$

then all such vacua may be classified in terms of integer winding numbers of the gauge field:

$$k = \int K^0 d^3x = \frac{1}{24\pi^2} \int \varepsilon^{ijk} \text{tr} U \partial_i U^{-1} U \partial_j U^{-1} U \partial_k U^{-1} d^3x. \quad (6)$$

(One should note that restricting ourselves only to spacetime manifolds with the R^4 topology, we exclude from consideration all non-trivial topological effects of gravity. A complete investigation of these effects requires inclusion of vacua with non-zero topological indices, both for the gauge and the gravitational fields.)

The transitions between the sectors with different winding numbers are of interest because they are accompanied by the corresponding change of the number of massless fermions due to the axial anomaly. To estimate the

amplitude of such a transition, we introduce a family of the VTV paths in the EYM configuration function space [8]:

$$\{A_j(\vec{x}, \lambda); g_{\mu\nu}(\vec{x}, \lambda)\}|_{K(r)}. \quad (7)$$

This family is labeled by a function $K(r)$ satisfying the following conditions

$$K(0) = 1, \quad K(\infty) = -1; \quad (8)$$

each path of the family is parameterized by $\lambda \in [0, \pi]$. The explicit form of the gauge field related to a path is chosen to be

$$A_\mu(t, \vec{x}) = \frac{i}{2}(1 - K(r))U\partial_\mu U^{-1}, \quad U = \exp(i\lambda n^a \tau^a), \quad (9)$$

where $n^a = (\sin\vartheta\cos\varphi, \sin\vartheta\sin\varphi, \cos\vartheta)$ is the unit vector. The gravitational field is

$$ds^2 = R_g^2 \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{2m}{r}\right) \sigma^2 dt^2 - \frac{dr^2}{1 - 2m/r} - r^2(d\vartheta^2 + \sin^2\vartheta d\varphi^2) \right\}, \quad (10)$$

with metric function $m(r)$ and $\sigma(r)$ being

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(r) &= \exp\left\{-2\sin^2\lambda \int_r^\infty K'^2 \frac{dr}{r}\right\}, \\ m(r) &= \frac{\sin^2\lambda}{\sigma(r)} \int_0^r (K'^2 + \sin^2\lambda \frac{(K^2 - 1)^2}{2r^2}) \sigma dr, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $R_g = \sqrt{4\pi}l_{pl}/g$ is the only dimensional quantity in the problem (l_{pl} being Planck's length). These fields satisfy the single non-trivial constraint equation appearing in the case:

$$G_0^0 = 8\pi GT_0^0. \quad (12)$$

When λ runs from zero to π the fields interpolate between the vacuum values (4). If $K(r)$ is a sufficiently smooth function then the geometry defined by Eqs.(10),(11) is everywhere regular and asymptotically flat. The corresponding ADM mass is

$$M = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} m(r). \quad (13)$$

Our basic approximation is the assumption that the quantum transition between distinct vacuum sectors occurs only along the paths (7)-(11). Notice that Bitar and Chang's approach gives an adequate description of the transition process provided one is able to take into account *all* VTV paths. But the main advantage of the method, perhaps, is that it may give a good description of the transition even if one takes only some particular set of these paths [9].

To estimate the transition amplitude, let us first choose a path from the family (7). To find the partial amplitude related to this path, allow for the parameter λ to depend on time: $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda(t)$, and calculate the action of the fields. It is worth noting at this stage that when the time dynamics is introduced, one may show explicitly that all paths (7) indeed interpolate between vacua with distinct winding numbers. To see this, suppose that $\lambda(t_0) = 0$, $\lambda(t_1) = \pi$, then the direct calculation of the gauge invariant Pontryagin index for the gauge field Eq.(9) yields [8, 23]

$$\nu = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt \int tr F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} \sqrt{-g} d^3x = 1, \quad (14)$$

so the time evolution along such a path has to change the winding number. Also, when λ in Eq.(9) depends on time, the non-zero time component of the gauge field arises. Passing to the $A_0 = 0$ gauge, one obtains explicitly

$$A_\mu = i \frac{1-K}{2} U_+ \partial_\mu U_+^{-1} + i \frac{1+K}{2} U_- \partial_\mu U_-^{-1},$$

$$U_\pm = \exp(i\lambda(K \pm 1)n^a \tau^a / 2), \quad (15)$$

which is zero when $\lambda = 0$, and a pure gauge with unit winding number when $\lambda = \pi$.

Let us pass to the calculation of the action. Inserting Eqs.(9)-(11) with $\lambda = \lambda(t)$ into (1) and performing direct but somewhat lengthy calculations [23], one may represent the result in the form

$$S_{EYM} = \frac{4\pi}{g^2} \int \left(\frac{\mu(\lambda)}{2} \dot{\lambda}^2 - U(\lambda) \right) dt, \quad (16)$$

where

$$\mu(\lambda) \equiv \mu[K(r), \lambda] = \int_0^\infty \frac{r^2}{\sigma} (K'^2 + 2\sin^2 \lambda \frac{(K^2 - 1)^2}{r^2 - 2mr}) dr, \quad (17)$$

and

$$U(\lambda) \equiv U[K(r), \lambda] = \sin^2 \lambda \int_0^\infty (K'^2 + \sin^2 \lambda \frac{(K^2 - 1)^2}{2r^2}) \exp(-2\sin^2 \lambda \int_r^\infty K'^2 \frac{dr}{r}) dr. \quad (18)$$

In these expressions quantities m , σ are given by Eq.(11), and $K(r)$ being a function specifying the path under consideration. One can see that the result obtained corresponds to the action of an effective particle with position-dependent mass, $\mu(\lambda)$, moving in a one-dimensional external potential $U(\lambda)$. This potential has the typical barrier shape: for each $K(r)$ it vanishes for the vacuum values, $\lambda = 0, \pi$, and reaches a maximum in between at $\lambda = \pi/2$ (the latter can be seen if we pass to a new independent variable $z = r/\sin \lambda$ under the integration in Eq.(18)). Notice that the potential coincides with the ADM mass (13) (that is true provided that the geometry described by the metric (10) is everywhere regular [23]).

Thus, we arrive at the one-dimensional barrier transition problem. The corresponding one-dimensional Schrödinger equation then reads

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{p^2}{2\mu(\lambda)} + U(\lambda) = E, \quad (19)$$

with p being the momentum conjugated to λ , and the quantity E has the sense of the energy of the asymptotically free quantum states (the operator ordering problem can be avoided in this case [9]). This allows us to write down the corresponding partial WKB transition amplitude as follows

$$\mathcal{A}_{K(r)} \equiv B \exp\{i \frac{4\pi}{g^2} \Phi[K(r)]\} = B \exp\{i \frac{4\pi}{g^2} \int_0^\pi d\lambda \sqrt{2\mu(\lambda)[E - U(\lambda)]}\}, \quad (20)$$

where B absorbs all other WKB factors, which are inessential for our present considerations. The subscript $K(r)$ indicates that this partial amplitude relates to a single path specified by $K(r)$. If the quantity $E - U(\lambda)$ is negative, then one should take the value of the square root lying in the upper half of the complex plane.

The last step in estimating the transition amplitude is to represent the total amplitude as the sum over all partial amplitudes (20):

$$\mathcal{A} = \sum_{K(r)} \mathcal{A}_{K(r)}. \quad (21)$$

This expression gives the amplitude of the winding number changing transition in the EYM theory at arbitrary energy E . It is clear, however, that taking the sum is virtually impossible. The only way to estimate this sum is to make use of the stationary phase approximation. However, as was shown in Ref.[9], the finding of the exact stationary phase path implies solving a system of the coupled differential equations, which, unfortunately, lies beyond our abilities.

To proceed further we will not calculate the amplitude, but consider instead a more simple problem. Namely, we want to find out under which conditions this amplitude will not be small.

We use the following terminology. Let the energy, E , be fixed. Consider a path (7) that lies entirely in the classically allowed region:

$$U[K(r), \lambda] < E, \quad \lambda \in [0, \pi]. \quad (22)$$

Such a path will be called *an overbarrier path*. If a path passes also through the classically forbidden region then we shall call it an *underbarrier path*, for the evolution along such a path implies barrier penetration.

For an underbarrier paths the amplitude (20) is small, as it includes the small tunneling factor. This allows us to exclude from the sum (21) the contribution of all underbarrier paths, as this contribution is certainly small. The remaining sum over the overbarrier paths will not be small if only this sum includes a term (or terms), $\mathcal{A}_{K(r)}$, whose value is stationary with respect to small variations of $K(r)$. Such a term corresponds to the contribution of a stationary phase path. Thus, the amplitude (21) will not be small provided there exists a stationary phase path on the set of all overbarrier paths. Therefore, to proceed further, we first need to select the overbarrier paths from the set (7), and next to look for a stationary phase path among them.

To select the overbarrier paths in accordance with Eq.(22) one has to know the properties of the potential $U[K(r), \lambda]$. It is useful to treat the functional $U[K(r), \lambda]$ in geometrical terms, viewing it as an infinite dimensional surface in the corresponding function space. Let us call this surface *an energy surface* or *a potential barrier surface*. It is natural to call the directions in this surface generated by $\partial/\partial\lambda$ and $\partial/\partial K(r)$ *a transverse direction* and *a longitudinal direction* respectively. Indeed, changing of λ with fixed $K(r)$ corresponds to motion across the barrier towards a neighbouring vacuum. Changing of $K(r)$

implies passing to other paths, i.e. the motion along the barrier. When $K(r)$ is fixed, the potential reaches a maximum at $\lambda = \pi/2$, so we will call the functional

$$\varepsilon[K(r)] = U[K(r), \lambda = \pi/2] \quad (23)$$

a *barrier height functional* and say that it defines the profile of the top of the barrier.

Consider the critical points of the energy surface. It is clear that such points have to belong to the top, $\lambda = \pi/2$. Direct variation of the functional (23) yields [23]

$$\delta\varepsilon = 2 \int_0^\infty \left\{ -\left(1 - \frac{2m}{r}\right) \sigma K' \right\}' + \frac{K(K^2 - 1)}{r^2} \sigma \right\} \delta K dr, \quad (24)$$

where $\delta K(0) = \delta K(\infty) = 0$, functions m, σ are given by Eq.(11) ($\lambda = \pi/2$). The vanishing of this variation implies the condition

$$\left(\left(1 - \frac{2m}{r}\right) \sigma K' \right)' = \sigma \frac{K(K^2 - 1)}{r^2}. \quad (25)$$

Next note that when $\lambda = \pi/2$, functions m and σ given by Eq.(11) obey the following equations

$$\sigma' = 2 \frac{K'^2}{r} \sigma, \quad (m\sigma)' = (K'^2 + \frac{(K^2 - 1)^2}{2r^2}) \sigma. \quad (26)$$

It is worth noting that Eqs.(25),(26) admit such solutions when the EYM fields (9), (10) coincide with the solutions of the EYM equations found by Bartnik and McKinnon [7]. These BK solutions are labeled by an integer, n . The function $K(r)$ for the n -th solution has n zeros and it is usually denoted by w_n . For odd values of n w_n obeys the conditions (8). The masses of these solutions are $M_n = \sqrt{4\pi} M_{pl} m_n / g$, where M_{pl} being Planck's mass and m_n increases as n grows from the minimal value $m_1 = 0.828$ to $m_\infty = 1$. Thus the (odd- n) BK solutions relate to critical points of the potential barrier surface separating distinct vacua in the EYM theory. This circumstance has allowed us to interpret in Ref.[8] these solutions as sphalerons (on more general grounds the correspondence between extrema of the energy and the action was considered in Ref.[12]).

It is clear now that if the energy E exceeds the mass of the n -th EYM sphaleron, then the path passing through this sphaleron (such a path is

defined by Eqs.(7)-(11) with $K(r) = w_n(r)$ as well as neighbouring paths will be overbarrier.

Next we are looking for the stationary phase path on the set of these overbarrier paths. Our aim is to show that the path passing through the sphaleron will be such a stationary phase path. This means that the quantum phase $\Phi[K(r)]$ defined by Eq.(20) with $K(r) = w_n(r)$ should be stationary on variations of $K(r)$. To check the stationarity of the phase let us consider an arbitrary variation of $K = w_n$:

$$K(r) = w_n(r) + \alpha\varphi(r), \quad (27)$$

where α is the variational parameter, and the perturbation obeys $\varphi(r) = O(r^2)$ as $r \rightarrow 0$, $\varphi(r) = O(1/r)$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Inserting this into $\Phi[K(r)]$, $U[K(r), \lambda]$ and $\varepsilon[K(r)]$ defined by Eqs.(18),(20), (23), one obtains the phase $\Phi_\varphi(\alpha)$, (index φ refers to the choice of the perturbation), and the one and two-dimensional sections of the energy surface: $\varepsilon_\varphi(\alpha)$, $U_\varphi(\alpha, \lambda)$. The phase $\Phi[K(r)]$ will be stationary if $\Phi_\varphi(\alpha)$ has an extremum for *any* $\varphi(r)$ in Eq.(27).

One should note that, strictly speaking, the exact stationary phase path is not contained in the path family (7). Finding such a path implies solving the general equations of motion [9], which lies beyond the scope of our present analysis. Paths (7) specified by $K = w_n$ may be only approximately stationary. This means that for these approximate paths and any independent perturbations $\varphi(r)$ in (27), the positions of the extremum of the corresponding phase functions $\Phi_\varphi(\alpha)$ do not coincide exactly with the position of the sphaleron, $\alpha = 0$, however they are close together. In other words, functional derivatives $\delta\Phi[K(r)]|_{K=w_n}$ although do not vanish exactly, are nevertheless small.

Consider first such perturbations $\varphi(r)$ which increase the barrier height: $\varepsilon(\alpha \neq 0) > \varepsilon(0)$; there are infinitely many such perturbations. One may see that the phase is stationary with respect to all these perturbations. Indeed, in this case the corresponding two-dimensional section of the energy surface, $U_\varphi(\alpha, \lambda)$, has the typical saddle shape shown in Fig.1. The saddle negative λ -direction on the picture (shown by the horizontal arrow) specifies *the transverse rolling down mode* of the sphaleron [14]. It is clear from this picture that the path passing through the sphaleron is the minimal potential energy path interpolating between distinct vacua, so it corresponds to an extremum of the phase. The analogous situation takes place in the elec-

troweak theory where the sphaleron is the highest-energy point on a minimal-energy path connecting distinct vacua, which implies the stationarity of the phase for such a path [4]. Direct numerical inspection shows that, for several ground state sphaleron energy-increasing perturbation modes $\varphi(r)$ checked, the phase $\Phi_\varphi(\alpha)$ indeed has an extremum (minimum) in the vicinity of zero value of α .

However, in the EYM theory, contrary to the situation in the electroweak case, not all perturbations (27) increase the barrier height, for sphalerons possess also *longitudinal* negative modes. Indeed, direct calculation [23] shows that in the vicinity of a sphaleron the following expansion holds

$$\varepsilon[w_n(r) + \varphi(r)] = \varepsilon[w_n(r)] + \delta^2\varepsilon + \dots, \quad (28)$$

where the first order term vanishes and dots denote higher order terms. The second order term reads

$$\delta^2\varepsilon = \int_0^\infty \varphi \left(-\frac{d^2}{dr_*^2} + V \right) \varphi dr_*, \quad (29)$$

with the new radial coordinate, r_* , being defined by the following relations $\frac{dr}{dr_*} = \sigma(1 - 2m/r)$, $r_*(r=0) = 0$. The effective potential is

$$V = \sigma^2 \left(1 - \frac{2m}{r} \right) \left\{ \frac{3w_n^2 - 1}{r^2} + \frac{8}{r^3} w'_n w_n (w_n^2 - 1) - \frac{4}{r^2} w_n'^2 \left(1 - \frac{(w_n^2 - 1)^2}{r^2} \right) \right\}, \quad (30)$$

where functions m and σ relate to corresponding sphaleron solutions, the derivatives are calculated with respect to r . One may see that the scalar product for different perturbation modes can be naturally defined as $\langle \varphi_1, \varphi_2 \rangle = \int \varphi_1 \varphi_2 dr_*$; independent modes being orthogonal. It is obvious that if the differential operator in Eq.(29) has negative eigenvalues,

$$\left(-\frac{d^2}{dr_*^2} + V \right) \varphi = \omega^2 \varphi, \quad \omega^2 < 0, \quad (31)$$

corresponding eigenfunctions, φ , will specify the energy decreasing perturbation. It is worth noting that Eq.(31) coincides (up to a constant multiplier) with that first derived by Straumann and Zhou [15] in their analysis of the linear stability of the BK solutions, provided that one identifies the quantity ω with the time frequency of perturbations of the background BK solution.

It is known [16], that when the potential V in Eq.(31) relates to the n -th BK solution, the equation has exactly n independent negative eigenvalue solutions. Thus, the n -th EYM sphaleron has, apart from one transverse negative modes, also n longitudinal negative modes. Inserting such perturbation modes in Eq.(27), one obtains the corresponding two-dimensional sections of the energy surface which have the typical shape shown in Fig.2. One may see from this picture that, for such a section, the path passing through the sphaleron is not the minimal energy path. So, with respect to these negative perturbations, the stationarity of the phase is not obvious (it is usually assumed that a sphaleron has to have one and only one negative mode in order to be significant for the transition processes [13]). Nevertheless, we are able to demonstrate the stationarity of the phase also in this case, at least for the ground state ($n = 1$) sphaleron.

For the ground state sphaleron there exists only one negative eigenmode to Eq.(31). It turns out that the corresponding perturbation (27) may be related to the rescaling of the sphaleron field. Namely, instead of Eq.(27) let

$$K(r) = w_1(\beta r), \quad (32)$$

where β is the scaling parameter. Inserting this in Eq.(18) one obtains the following two dimensional section of the energy surface:

$$U(\beta, \lambda) = \beta \sin^2 \lambda \int_0^\infty (w_1'^2 + \sin^2 \lambda \frac{(w_1^2 - 1)^2}{2r^2}) \exp(-2\beta^2 \sin^2 \lambda \int_r^\infty w_1'^2 \frac{dr}{r}) dr, \quad (33)$$

(here $w_1 = w_1(r)$), the value $U(1, \pi/2)$ being the sphaleron mass. This function tends to zero when $\beta \rightarrow 0, \infty$ as well as when $\lambda \rightarrow 0, \pi$. The plot of this function is depicted in Fig.2. This picture demonstrates explicitly the existence of the two independent sphaleron negative modes. One such mode is the transverse rolling down mode [14] (the λ -direction on the picture), the other is the longitudinal negative mode [15] (the β -direction). (Note that the infinitesimal scaling mode, $\varphi = \partial_\beta w_1(\beta r)|_{\beta=1} = r w_1'(r)$, is not the exact eigenmode for the Eq.(31), but rather a superposition of the true negative eigenmode and some other mode).

The scaling behaviour of the quantum phase is defined by the inserting (32) into (20):

$$\Phi_{scale}(\beta) = \int_0^\pi d\lambda \sqrt{2\mu(\beta, \lambda)[E - U(\beta, \lambda)]}, \quad (34)$$

where $U[\beta, \lambda]$ is given by Eq.(33) and

$$\mu(\beta, \lambda) = \frac{1}{\beta} \int_0^\infty \frac{r^2}{\sigma} (w_1'^2 + 2\sin^2 \lambda \frac{(w_1^2 - 1)^2}{r^2 - 2\beta m r}) dr, \quad (35)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(r) &= \exp\{-2\beta^2 \sin^2 \lambda \int_r^\infty w_1'^2 \frac{dr}{r}\}, \\ m(r) &= \frac{\beta \sin^2 \lambda}{\sigma(r)} \int_0^r (w_1'^2 + \sin^2 \lambda \frac{(w_1^2 - 1)^2}{2r^2}) \sigma dr. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Now, one may see that the phase (34) indeed has an extremum. First note that when β is small, the phase $\Phi_{scale}(\beta) \sim 1/\sqrt{\beta}$, i.e. it diverges when $\beta \rightarrow 0$ (remember that the energy E exceeds the sphaleron mass, that is, the maximal value of the potential drawn in Fig.2). Also, and this is the crucial point, $\Phi_{scale}(\beta)$ diverges when β tends to some value $\beta_c = 1.465$, because the integral entering Eq.(35) diverges in this limit. The value $\beta = \beta_c$ corresponds to such a rescaling of the sphaleron field when the rescaled configuration begins to acquire an event horizon (all of the paths (7),(32) with $\beta > \beta_c$ pass through virtual black holes). At the horizon the quantity $r^2 - 2\beta m r$ entering the denominator in Eq.(35) vanishes, so the integral diverges as does the phase. So, somewhere in between, $0 < \beta < \beta_c$, the phase must have a minimum (see Fig.3).

Thus we can see that when the energy exceeds the ground state EYM sphaleron mass, the path passing through the sphaleron insures extremality of the quantum phase with respect to any small variations inside the path family (7). The existence of this extremum means that the sum in Eq.(21), being evaluated via stationary phase approximation, will include the contribution of a stationary point. In other words, there is the constructive interference on the set of the overbarrier paths (7), which has to lead to an enhancement of the transition.

It turns out that the analysis carried out above for the ground state sphaleron remains valid for the higher (odd $n > 1$) sphalerons. This means that each higher sphaleron introduces a stationary phase path, only if the phase will be stationary also with respect to the variations corresponding to the additional $n - 1$ longitudinal higher sphaleron negative modes, which is very plausible. Thus, if the energy exceeds the masses of all the EYM sphalerons (i.e. $E > 1$ in the dimensionless units used), the sum in Eq.(21)

includes the contributions of (infinitely) many stationary points (one point for each higher sphaleron), which may lead to an additional enhancement of the transition rate.

When the energy is less than the ground state sphaleron mass, the situation changes. The overbarrier paths in this case also exist, as can be seen in Fig.2. However, there exists no stationary phase path, so the constructive interference is absent.

All this allows us to conclude that in the extreme high energy limit the effects of gravity have to lead to an enhancement of the intensity of the winding number changing transitions. This means that the rate of the *inclusive* [6] fermion number violating reactions at very high energies is not small. Such reactions lead to the formation of intermediate sphaleron states, the decay of which will produce a large number of gravitons and gauge bosons [17] as well as extra fermions due to the anomaly. It has been argued recently by Gibbons and Steif [18], that the decay of the BK particles should be accompanied by fermion number non-conservation. Our arguments show that, at high energies, the probability of BK particles being born and subsequently decaying is not small. Notice that the energies available are very large – the masses of the EYM sphalerons are of the order of M_{pl}/g . Such processes may arise naturally within the context of superstring theory leading to a “primordial” fermion asymmetry. Indeed, lower order terms of the expansion of the superstring action in the string tension, give rise to the coupled Einstein-Yang-Mills-Dilaton (EYMD) equation of motion. These equations possess classical solutions, which resemble in many respects the BK solutions and coincide exactly with them in the vanishing dilatonic coupling limit [19]. It is very likely, that these EYMD particles may also be interpreted as sphalerons [20, 21], and our present analysis may be extended to that case.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Professor Norbert Straumann for a careful reading of the manuscript and also Professor Petr Hajicek for a helpful critique.

This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation.

References

- [1] R.Jackiw, C.Rebbi, Phys.Rev.Lett. 37 (1976) 172;
C.G.Callan, R.F.Dashen, D.J.Gross, Phys.Lett.B 63 (1976) 334.
- [2] G.t'Hooft, Phys.Rev.Lett. 37 (1976) 8; Phys.Rev.D 14 (1976) 3432.
- [3] S.L.Adler, Phys.Rev. 177 (1969) 2426.
- [4] N.S.Manton, Phys.Rev.D 28 (1983) 2019;
F.R.Klinkhamer, N.S.Manton, Phys.Rev.D 30 (1984) 2212.
- [5] V.K.Kuzmin, V.A.Rubakov, M.E.Shaposhnikov, Phys.Lett.B 155 (1985) 36;
A.Ringwald, Phys.Lett.B 201 (1988) 510.
- [6] P.Arnold, L.McLerran, Phys.Rev.D 37 (1988) 1020;
A.Ringwald, Nucl.Phys.B 330 (1990) 1.
- [7] R.Bartnik, J.McKinnon, Phys.Rev.Lett. 61 (1988) 141.
- [8] D.V.Gal'tsov, M.S.Volkov, Phys.Lett.B 273 (1991) 255.
- [9] K.M.Bitar, S.J.Chang, Phys.Rev.D 17 (1978) 486; Phys.Rev.D 18 (1978) 435.
- [10] M.S.Volkov, D.V.Gal'tsov, Pis'ma Zh. Eks. Teor. Fiz. 50 (1989) 312;
(JETP Lett. 50 (1989) 346).
- [11] E.Witten, Comm.Math.Phys. 80 (1981) 381.
- [12] D.Sudarsky, R.M.Wald, Phys.Rev.D 46 (1992) 1453.
- [13] L.G.Yaffe, Phys.Rev.D 40 (1990) 3463.
- [14] D.V.Gal'tsov, M.S.Volkov, Phys.Lett.A 162 (1992) 144.
- [15] N.Straumann, Z.H.Zhou, Phys.Lett.B 237 (1990) 353.
- [16] Z.H.Zhou, Helv.Phys.Acta 65 (1992) 767.
- [17] Z.H.Zhou, N.Straumann, Nucl.Phys.B 360 (1991) 180.

- [18] G.W.Gibbons, A.R.Steif, Phys.Lett.B 314 (1993) 13;
Phys.Lett.B 320 (1994) 245.
- [19] E.E.Donets, D.V.Gal'tsov, Phys.Lett.B 302 (1993) 441;
G.Lavrelashvili, D.Maison, Nucl.Phys.B 410 (1993) 407.
- [20] E.E.Donets, D.V.Gal'tsov, M.S.Volkov, preprint CINVESTAV-GRG-10,
hep-th/9308068.
- [21] G.Lavrelashvili, D.Maison, preprint MPI-Ph/93-55, hep-th/9307159.
- [22] L.D.Landau & E.M.Lifshitz, The classical theory of fields (Pergamon,
Oxford, 1975).
- [23] M.S.Volkov, preprint ZU-TH 1/94, hep-th/9401071.

Figure captions

Fig.1 Typical shape of the energy-surface two-dimensional section $U_\varphi(\lambda, \alpha)$ for energy increasing sphaleron perturbation modes φ . The surface forms a barrier separating distant EYM vacua ($\lambda = 0, \pi$). Position of the sphaleron ($\alpha = 0, \lambda = \pi/2$) is shown by the vertical arrow.

Fig.2 Plot of the function $U(\beta, \lambda)$ defined by Eq.(33). Vertical arrow shows the sphaleron position ($\beta = 1, \lambda = \pi/2$). Horizontal arrows correspond to the transverse (λ -direction) and the longitudinal (β -direction) sphaleron negative modes.

Fig.3 Behaviour of the quantum phase $\Phi_{scale}(\beta)$ defined by Eq.(34) with $E = 1$. The path passing through the sphaleron is specified by the value $\beta = 1$.

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-th/9312005v2>

This figure "fig2-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-th/9312005v2>

This figure "fig3-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-th/9312005v2>